



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/935,222 | 08/22/2001 | Junichi Yamagishi | F-7051 | 8696 |

28107 7590 10/04/2004
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP
122 EAST 42ND STREET
SUITE 4000
NEW YORK, NY 10168

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

CHO, UN C

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2682 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/935,222

Applicant(s)

YAMAGISHI, JUNICHI

Examiner

Un C Cho

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mozer (US 5,657,380) in view of von Bauer et al. (US 5,428,388).

Regarding claim 1, Mozer teaches a wireless call system (automatic door answering and message system) comprising an outdoor unit (exterior unit, Fig. 1, 28, Col. 4, lines 49 – 51) installed on the outside of an entrance of a structure having a door lockable with lock means (door release mechanism, Col. 8, lines 15 – 18), for calling a resident in the structure, an indoor unit (interior unit, Fig. 1, 32, Col. 4, lines 51 – 53) connected to the outdoor unit by radio (RF link, Fig. 1, 20, Col. 4, lines 42 – 45), for informing the resident of the presence of a visitor upon receiving a signal from the outdoor unit and allowing the resident to answer the visitor through the outdoor unit (exterior unit) (Col. 4, lines 54 – 67).

However, Mozer does not specifically disclose the outdoor unit having image pickup means for picking up an image of the visitor making a call with the outdoor unit, the indoor unit being portable and having display means for displaying the visitor's image picked up by the image pickup means, the indoor unit being portable to an optional location and allowing at the optional location

Art Unit: 2682

the resident to check the visitor displayed on the display means. On the other hand, von Bauer teaches the outdoor unit (door bell station, Fig. 1a, 31) having image pickup means (CCD camera, Fig. 1a, 45) for picking up an image of the visitor making a call with the outdoor unit (door bell station, Col. 7, lines 15 – 28), the indoor unit (video receiver station, Fig. 1b, 32) being portable and having display means (the video receiver station receives the appropriate signals from the door bell station and displays the received information on a TV) for displaying the visitor's image picked up by the image pickup means and the indoor unit (video receiver station) being portable to an optional location (the video receiver station can be connected to any TV) and allowing at the optional location the resident to check the visitor displayed on the display means (Col. 6, lines 34 – 51 and Col. 7, lines 28 – 34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the technique of von Bauer to the system of Mozer in order to provide an annunciator system including a remote sensing station which is capable of transmitting audio and visual data to a monitoring station via modulated radio waves.

Regarding claim 2, Mozer in view of von Bauer as applied to claim 1 above discloses the outdoor unit (exterior unit, Fig. 1, 28) having message taking means for taking a message from the visitor (a single microphone, Fig. 1, 24) and the indoor unit (interior unit, Fig. 1, 32) having message playback means for playing back the visitor's message taken by the message taking means (a single speaker, Fig. 1, 22) (Mozer, Col. 4, lines 42 – 67).

Art Unit: 2682

3. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mozer in view of von Bauer as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nakamura (US 6,466,261).

Regarding claim 3, Mozer in view of von Bauer as applied to claim 1 above discloses that the visitor's image is picked up by the image pickup means (CCD camera located at the door bell station (exterior unit), von Bauer, Col. 7, lines 15 – 28) and displaying means to display the visitor's image (von Bauer, Col. 6, lines 34 – 51 and Col. 7, lines 28 – 34).

However, Mozer in view of von Bauer as applied to claim 1 above differ from claim 3 in the present invention in that the indoor unit has image recording means for recording the visitor's image picked up by the image pickup means and the display means is able to display the visitor's image recorded by the image recording means. On the other hand, Nakamura teaches image recording means (memory processing section, Fig. 2, 7) for recording the visitor's image picked up by the image pickup means (CCD camera) and the display means (TV) being able to display the visitor's image recorded by the image recording means (Nakamura, Col. 4, lines 5 – 15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the technique of Nakamura to the modified system of Mozer and von Bauer in order to provide a door camera unit having recording means, which includes a video memory, in which only necessary video images are automatically recorded.

Regarding claim 4, Mozer in view of von Bauer and further in view of Nakamura as applied to claim 3 above discloses the image recording means for recording the visitor's image picked up by the image pickup means, the display means is able to display the visitor's image recorded by the image recording means (Nakamura, Col. 4, lines 5 – 15) and message recording means for recording the visitor's message taken by the message taking means and the message playback means is able to play back the visitor's message recorded by the message recording means (Mozer, Col. 5, lines 22 – 42).

4. Claims 5 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mozer in view of von Bauer and further in view of Nakamura as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Scott et al. (US 6,272,562).

Regarding claim 5, Mozer in view of von Bauer and further in view of Nakamura as applied to claim 3 above discloses the wireless call system (automatic door answering and message system) having unlocking control means for unlocking the lock mechanism (door release mechanism, Mozer, Col. 8, lines 15 – 18).

However, Mozer in view of von Bauer and further in view of Nakamura as applied to claim 3 above differ from claim 5 in the present invention in that Mozer in view of Bauer and further in view of Nakamura does not specifically disclose the feature of the outdoor unit having biometric information input means for inputting biometric information on the visitor and the wireless call system further

having unlock control means for unlocking the lock means if the biometric information input through the biometric information input means agrees with registered biometric information. On the other hand, Scott teaches the feature of the outdoor unit (Access Control Unit, Fig. 1, 100) having biometric information input means (finger print scanner, Fig. 1, 108) for inputting biometric information on the visitor (Col. 3, lines 32 – 62) and the ACU (Access Control Unit) further having unlock control means for unlocking the lock means if the biometric information input through the biometric information input means agrees with registered biometric information (granting access to the individual after biometric analysis, Col. 1, lines 9 – 45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the technique of Scott to the modified system of Mozer and von Bauer in order to provide a compact ACU which allows it to be incorporated into a wider range of access control applications, such as, prison security points and entry/exit locations in a secure building or area, and allows it to be integrated more easily with existing computer systems.

Regarding claim 6, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5.

Regarding claim 7, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5.

Regarding claim 8, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5.

5. Claims 9 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mozer in view of von Bauer and further in view of Nakamura and further in view of Scott as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Setlak et al. (US 6,628,812).

Regarding claim 9, Mozer in view of von Bauer and further in view of Nakamura and further in view of Scott as applied to claim 5 above discloses the biometric information input means is fingerprint input means, the unlock control means unlocks the lock means if a fingerprint input through the fingerprint input means agrees with a registered fingerprint (Col. 3, lines 32 – 62, granting access to the individual after biometric analysis, Col. 1, lines 9 – 45).

However, Mozer in view of von Bauer and further in view of Nakamura and further in view of Scott as applied to claim 5 above differ from claim 9 in the present invention in that Mozer, von Bauer, Nakamura and Scott does not specifically disclose a part of the outdoor unit is made of conductive material and is grounded and the part of the outdoor unit made of conductive material is touched by a person before inputting the person's fingerprint into the fingerprint input means to release static electricity from the person. On the other hand Setlak discloses a part of the fingerprint sensor is made of conductive material (ESD suppressor, Fig. 3, 101 is connected to the first electrode, Fig. 3, 54) and is grounded (ground, Fig. 3), and the part of the fingerprint sensor unit made of conductive material is touched by a person before inputting the person's fingerprint into the fingerprint input means to release static electricity from the person (Setlak, Col. 7, lines 4 – 15 and Col. 8, lines 1 – 7). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the technique Setlak to the modified system of Mozer, von Bauer, Nakamura and Scott in order to provide a fingerprint sensor package which is resistant to transients such as ESD (Electro Static Discharge) events.

Regarding claim 10, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 11, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 12, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 13, Mozer in view of von Bauer further in view of Nakamura and further in view of Scott and further in view of Setlak as applied to claim 9 teaches the conductive material (conductive strip or external electrode, Fig. 3, 54) is any one of nonconductive resin mixed with conductive metal powder, nonconductive resin mixed with carbon fiber, and conductive resin (the conductive material can be made of any combination such as multiple conductive and insulating layers, Col. 7, lines 4 – 29, Col. 8, lines 1 – 7 and 19 – 67).

Regarding claim 14, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 13.

Regarding claim 15, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 13.

Regarding claim 16, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 13.

Regarding claim 17, Mozer in view of von Bauer further in view of Nakamura and further in view of Scott and further in view of Setlak as applied to claim 9 teaches that the part of the outdoor unit made of conductive material is one of a call button used to make a call and a message input button used to input a message (the conductive material in exterior unit activates the calling and messaging function, Col. 5, lines 1 - 42).

Regarding claim 18, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

Regarding claim 19, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

Regarding claim 20, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

Regarding claim 21, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

Regarding claim 22, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

Regarding claim 23, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

Regarding claim 24, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mun et al. (US 6,094,213) discloses a videoconference system used in home automation for performing audio and video conferencing between a personal computer and a videophone as well as remote conference system.

Schanhals et al. (US 6,337,856) discloses a data communication system for use in a work environment to establish a connection between a data communication device and an access point in connection with a communication system and with a multimedia system providing a multimedia signal.

Hoffmann et al. (US 6,256,479) discloses a door intercom for a dwelling, the intercom comprising a street panel and an indoor set, the street panel being provided with a call button and being connected to an electric latch fitted to a door of the dwelling, the street panel including a radio transmitter and receiver, means for recognizing a latch-opening code received by the receiver, a stand-alone electrical power supply, and means for activating the electric circuit of the latch.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Un C Cho whose telephone number is (703)305-8725. The examiner can normally be reached on M ~ F 8:00AM to 4:30PM.

Art Unit: 2682

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on (703)308-6739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Un C Cho *UC* *9/28/04*
Examiner
Art Unit 2682

Lester G. Kincaid
10/1/04
LESTER G. KINCAID
PRIMARY EXAMINER